

REMARKS

In the Office Action,¹ the Examiner rejected claims 2, 6-9, 13-15, and 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,212,643 to Yoshida ("Yoshida") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,945,927 to Nakayama et al. ("Nakayama"); and rejected claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida in view of Nakayama, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,012,014 to Koyanagi et al. ("Koyanagi").

Applicants amend claims 2 and 9. Claims 2, 6-9, and 13-23 remain pending and under examination.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 2, 6-9, and 13-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established at least because the differences between the prior art and Applicants' claims are such that it would not have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the prior art to arrive at Applicants' claimed invention.

Independent claim 2 recites an electronic map apparatus comprising a microcomputer that "displays a cursor indicating a scroll center in close proximity to a common center of the plurality of arcs irrespective of a location of the electronic map apparatus" (emphases added). None of Yoshida, Nakayama, and Koyanagi, taken individually or in combination, teaches or suggests the claimed microcomputer.

Yoshida discloses a reference numeral 12 that "denotes a current position indicating mark showing the current position of the vehicle." Yoshida, 3:55-66.

Nakayama also simply discloses a cursor indicating a "present position." Nakayama,

¹ The Office Action contains characterizations of the claims and the related art with which Applicants do not necessarily agree. Unless expressly noted otherwise, Applicants decline to subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Figs. 8, 17A; 14:47-60. And, Koyanagi discloses a “triangular mark in the screen [that] represents the current position of the vehicle.” Koyanagi, 5:11-15. Accordingly, none of Yoshida, Nakayama, and Koyanagi, taken individually or in combination, teaches or suggests displaying “a cursor indicating a scroll center in close proximity to a common center of the plurality of arcs irrespective of a location of the electronic map apparatus,” as recited by claim 2 (emphases added).

Independent claim 9, although of different scope than claim 2, patentably distinguishes from the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 2. Claims 6-8 and 13-23 depend from independent claims 2 or 9 and therefore also patentably distinguish from the cited references for at least the same reasons as claims 2 and 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 2, 6-9, and 13-23 under § 103(a).

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.



Dated: October 15, 2008

By: _____
Nathan A. Sloan
Reg. No. 56,249
(404) 653-6464